

*US Serial No. 09/669,178
Attorney Docket No. 81687RLO*

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al., US 4,887,161, in view of Toyoda et al., US 4,420,773 and DiSanto et al., US 5,508,720.

The Examiner accepts Applicants position that the Watanabe reference does not disclose applying a power source from the camera to the display when the image bearing medium is in the camera and not applying power to the display when disconnected from the camera. Watanabe also as the Examiner acknowledges does not continue to display images captured in the camera after removal of the display from the camera and no power is applied to the display. These features are clearly set forth in element (b) of claim 1. The Examiner should note that there is only one power supply noted in claim 1 element (a). Element (b) recites that the display continues to display such image(s) or information related to captured images after removal from the display and that after disconnection no power is applied to the display. There is nothing in Watanabe that would provide any motivation or suggestion for this feature.

The Toyoda references discloses a camera with a removable storage unit. In all cases, the display of Toyoda is connected a power supply. The Examiner recognizes that when the storage unit is separated from the camera it operates on its own battery supply. The Examiner's position is that Watanabe can be modified by Toyoda to produce the camera structure set forth in claim 1. There is nothing in Toyoda which discusses or suggests that no power should be applied to the display after its removal from the camera as required by claim 1. Why would there be any motivation in Toyoda to provide a display that once removed from the camera no longer needs a power supply since Toyoda clearly requires a power supply with their type of display?

DiSanto discloses a portable electronic device with a removable electrophoretic image display (EPID). The DiSanto display is directed to writing on paper by an ordinary pen or pencil that is converted to an electrical signal and reproduced on the EPID. Applicants have previously pointed out that they fail to see how DiSanto could even be applied for use with a camera. The camera

*US Serial No. 09/669,178
Attorney Docket No. 81687RLO*

captures the images and in the DiSanto device, a user physically forms graphic images which are displayed electrically on the EPID. There is no digital memory for storing images or information in the EPID beyond that which is visible. In DiSanto a user on a telephone or a telecommunications link makes notes which are then displayed on the EPID. The EPID is used to store a single graphic representation produced by a user. (see col. 3, lines 29-36) DiSanto in Fig. 1 has a fax machine which will fax the written information provided by a user. That information is also stored on the EPID for further reference by the user. How can this arrangement even suggest itself for use in a digital camera where the images are captured by the camera and transferred to a display in the camera? Moreover, how can this arrangement provide any suggestion for Applicants claimed arrangement wherein the removable image bearing medium captures images in the camera and then can be removed and the display functions without the use of an additional power supply. Why would any one skilled in the art look to an EPID for any suggestion or motivation for combination in a digital camera when EPIDs can't be used in a digital camera? The answer is there is no motivation for the present invention in this type of EPID device which is used for storing a single image after it has been faxed or transmitted.

Applicants fails to see how any of the references taken singly or any combination disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. Similarly, claim 21 also is not suggested or disclosed by these references. These two independent are believed to define unobvious subject matter and should be allowed. The remaining dependent claims depend on claim 1 and should be allowed along with it.

If there are any problems with this response, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

US Serial No. 09/669,178
Attorney Docket No. 81687RLO

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond L. Owens
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 22,363

RLO:das
Telephone 585-477-4653
Facsimile 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.